CHAPTER VII

TESTING THE THEORY OF VOCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Discussion

We propose in this chapter to

1) Summarize the findings of the previous chapters

2) Examine the interrelationship of the outcome measures

3) Test the basic hypothesis, the validity of the psychological model - more specifically the best fit model of Hall & Schneider to Indian conditions

For this purpose we would direct attention on the absence of conditions for psychological success particularly among the Assistants by summarizing the findings of the previous chapters.

We have noticed that in the chapter on Work Activities, the only Activity which performed by more than 50% of the Assistants is Preaching. Similarly, we found that in the age-group 26-35 years, one activity was performed a great deal by more than 50 percent viz. Preaching and in the next age-group 36-45 no activity was performed. These two age-groups comprised predominantly of Assistants. We pointed out that the
above findings may be due to accountability, lack of time, lack of priorities or an apathy or withdrawal.

On Values, particularly interpersonal, that have relevance for the dimension of authority, Assistants among the three groups favour semi-shared and fully-shared authority. Vicars do not value fully-shared authority and predominantly prefer unshared authority.

In Work Culture we found that in their First Assignment, the Assistants score lowest on Work Challenge, Supportive autonomy, Superior effectiveness. Again, we found as was anticipated that Specials scored highest on Recognition and tied with Vicars on Nurturant Control and Supportive Autonomy.

In the Present Assignment, Specials have as in the First Assignment, the highest score on Recognition but in addition have the highest score on Supportive Autonomy and Superior Effectiveness. Assistants are lowest among the three groups on all Work Climate Clusters except Mutuality.

The Vicars have the highest score on Work Challenge. In fact Assistants do not experience Work Challenge, Supportive Autonomy and Superior
Support both in their First Assignment and Present Assignment.

When we examined the Importance of Activities to Work Climate (Present Assignment), we found that Work Challenge was the only factor that correlated with four out of the seven activities (Administration: $r = 0.20$, Matrimonial Duties: $r = 0.20$, Parochial: $r = 0.19$ and Teaching / Fund raising: $r = 0.31$).

We noticed that of all the Work Climate Factors, the highest correlation between Utilisation of Skill and the same, was with Work Challenge: $r = 0.61$, Supportive Autonomy: $r = 0.52$, Superior Support: $r = 0.41$ and Role Integration: $r = 0.40$.

Hall and Schneider had obtained a correlation between Work Challenge and Use of Skills and Abilities of: $r = 0.48$ and $r = 0.57$ respectively.

A significant data that emerged is the lack of any relationship between Utilization of Skill and the Work Climate Factor of Mutuality. We had earlier pointed out that Assistants scored the highest on Mutuality.
The importance of the First Assignment was perceived by practically all groups 48.3 percent and this is borne out in the detailed analysis between First Assignment and Work Climate Factors as well as Utilization of Skill and Job Satisfaction.

The Assistants score significantly low on all five dimensions of Job Satisfaction: Work Satisfaction, Promotion Opportunities, Co-workers Supervision on Present Assignment, Pay and Congrua.

The Specials also do score lower than Vicars except on Supervision where their mean score is significantly higher because of close interaction with Superiors.

What emerged strongly in examining the relationship between Work Climate factors and Job Satisfaction (Work Assignment) is that Work Challenge which in the First Assignment correlated with this sub-scale of JDI: $r = .24$ now correlates in the Present Assignment: $r = .55$.

Similarly, Supportive Autonomy and Superior Support correlates with this sub-scale: $r = .26$ and $r = .20$ in the First Assignment respectively whereas in the Present Assignment it correlates more strongly: $r = .34$ and $r = .31$ respectively.
This lends strong support to the proposition that where Work Challenge and Support and coaching are present, there is a high sense of job satisfaction.

The Utilisation of skill is lowest for assistants 7.7 percent as against 19.1 percent for Vicars and 42.9 for Specials, not very different from the Hatford Diocesan Clergy of 5.6 for Curates (Assistants).

The correlation between Work Satisfaction and Utilisation of Skill is: \( r = .51 \) again very close to the Hatford study of: \( r = .53 \).

We examined the relationship of self-esteem to self-identity and its bearings on the three groups as well as Work Climate, Skill Utilization and Work Satisfaction.

Supportive autonomy is highly related to Superior Support \( (r = .69, p < .01) \); to Work Challenge \( (r = .48 p < .001) \); to Role Integration \( (r = .75 p < .001) \).

It was also highly related to Utilisation of Skill \( (r = .52 p < .001) \) and Work Satisfaction \( (r = .34 p < .001) \).

Work Challenge was also highly related to Role Integration \( (r = .34 p < .001) \); and to Utilisation of
Skill \( (r = .62 \ p < .001) \); and Work Satisfaction \( (r = .56 \ p < .001) \).

Role Integration was significantly related to Utilization of Skills \( (r = .40 \ p < .01) \); Work Satisfaction \( (r = .40 \ p < .01) \) and to Self Image \( (r = .36 \ p < .01) \).

Self-Image is significantly related to four Work Climate Assignment Characteristics. It is related to Work Challenge \( (r = .30 \ p < .01) \); to Role Integration \( (r = .36 \ p < .01) \); to Supportive Autonomy \( (r = .20 \ p < .01) \); and Mutuality \( (r = .24 \ p < .01) \). It is also significantly though not strongly related to Superior Support \( (r = .14 \ p < .01) \).

In relation to Work Satisfaction and Self-image (General) correlation was obtained of \( r = .20 \). Similarly Utilization of Skill correlated low but significantly with Self-Image (General) \( r = .20 \).

In the Superior sub-identity, the Specials have the highest means on Supportive dimensions and Assistants lowest on all three dimensions.

In the Colleague sub-identity the Assistants have the highest score on Intellectual and Involved. It
might be pointed out that Assistants do score highest on Mutuality.

In the Laity sub-identity, Assistants score the least in the Involved dimension.

In the General sub-identity, the Vicars have the highest mean and the Specials the lowest means on all the three dimensions.

We have mentioned later on pages 216-18 that the most critical variables studied and the reasons why they are considered as critical. They are 1) Work Satisfaction, 2) Use of Skills and Abilities, 3) Work Challenge & Means, 4) Supportive Autonomy, 5) Sum of amount of activities times importance of activities and 6) General self-image.

Intercorrelations of the Outcome Measures (1973)

Hall and Schneider examined the relationships of the outcome measures to find out "the extent to which authority pervades the other measures. The broad question they posed is "Does satisfaction with supervision pervade all other measures to the extent that all we are measuring is satisfaction with supervision?"
They further raise a series of specific questions in regard to the relationships as

1. How is supervision related to the way I see myself in general and in different relationships.
2. How is supervision related to the way I describe my satisfaction.
3. How is supervision related to my feelings that I am actualizing myself in my present assignment.

The above questions can be answered by comparing the variables which predominate and/or the most central to the outcome variables. Again the pattern of relationships are of immense interest for those who would indicate some interesting generalization.

One generalization proposed by Hall & Schneider is that can be made is that for all the priest, the way they see themselves is less related to their general self-image than is either of the other sub-identity self-images.

To check the validity of the above, for each sub-identity, the average of correlations of the three self-image dimensions is taken vis-a-vis the general self-image.
Hall and Schneider found that the way the priest see themselves in general, they see themselves least in relationship with their superiors (r overall = .48) and most like that in relationship with parishioners (r overall = .78) and in between in relationship with colleagues (r = .73).

In our study we obtained very similar findings. The Bombay Diocesan Clergy see themselves least in relationship with the superior (r overall = .53) and most like that in relationship with the parishioners (r overall = .70) and in relationships with colleagues (r overall = .64).

The intercorrelations matrices - Table 48 - includes all the variables initially considered to be criterion variables. The significance level of the inter-correlations are given in Appendix E.

The coefficients were cast into a traditional set of heterotrait a monomethod and heterotrait heteromethod triangles to aid in the discriminant validation analysis suggested by Campbell and Fiske (1959). Convergent validity is defined as the agreement among independent measures of the same construct. Discriminant validity exist when a construct do not correlate with measures of a different construct that is measured by the same method.
The triangles depicted on each matrix draws attention to the intercorrelations for the scales within a particular global construct: JDI, self-image, etc. The triangles point out that the three traits measured by the self-image semantic differential tend to be interrelated at about \( r = 0.63 \) within each sub-identity relationship (friends, laity) and in the general self-image description.

The sub-identity diagonals indicate the extent to which trait being assessed is independent of the sub-identity relationship in which the priest responded. The trait supportive is more highly related to supportive in other sub-identities and in general than it is related to any other trait in any other sub-identity.

We also found that the intercorrelations of the three traits within a sub-identity tend to be higher than any trait is related to the same trait in another sub-identity. This means that the trait supportive has similar meaning regardless of the sub-identity under consideration; again the sub-identity has meaning irrespective of the trait under consideration.

Campbell and Fiske (1959) refer to four aspects bearing upon the question of validity. The first is
the question of convergent validity, which requires the entries in the validity diagonal to be significantly different from zero and sufficiently large to encourage further examination of validity.

All eighteen of the validity diagonal coefficients are significantly different from zero. Only one (.34) is low. Hence this requirement is largely met.

These are three criteria for meeting the discriminant validity requirement the first is that a validity diagonal value be higher than the values lying in the same column of the heterotrait - heteromethod triangles (enclosed by dotted lines.) This requirement in our case is met.

The second requirement is that values in the validity be greater than corresponding values in the heterotrait - heteromethod triangles (enclosed by solid lines). This also seems to be fairly well met.

The third criterion is that the same pattern of trait interrelationship be shown in all of the heterotrait-heteromethod blocks. We notice the supportive with the involved bears a higher relationship than supportive with intellectual. We find that there is a pattern to the trait interrelationships meeting the last criterion for the discriminant validity, to some extent.
### Table 48

Inter-correlation of skill utilisation and JD1 measures and self-image relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use of skills and abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work Satisfaction (JDI)</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervision satisfaction (JDI)</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supportive Superior</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intellectual superior</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Involved superior</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supportive Colleagues</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intellectual colleagues</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Involved Colleague</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Supportive Laity</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Intellectual Laity</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Involved Laity</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Supportive General</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Intellectual General</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Involved General</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inter-correlations is for the total population.
Sample size 141 but varies due to incomplete data on some measures.

*P < .05  **P < .01  *** < .001
Therefore, though we had not obtained comparisons separately for the different positions, we could state that for the total sample that priests feel least "themselves" (in regard to their general self-image when they operate in subordinate-subidentity, in relating with their superiors.

It is interesting to note that Hall and Schneider reported, that the only aspect which related to the satisfaction dimensions and the use of skill, was self-image in relation to superior. As against their reported findings of a correlation between superior sub-identity - Supportive (Superior), intellectual (Superior) and Involved (Superior) with utilization of skills of r's of .30, .27 and .27 respectively, we obtained for the same intercorrelation r's of .32, .25 and .31 respectively.

With regard to the correlations obtained by Hall and Schneider of the superior (sub-identity-supportive (Superior), Intellectual (Superior) and Involved (Superior) with work satisfaction of r's of .35, .33 and .27 respectively, we obtained very similar results of r's of .41, .35 and .37 for the same intercorrelations.
While Hall and Schneider found that general self-image and self-image in relation to the laity and close friends are not strongly correlated with skill utilization or satisfaction and we found similarly no correlation in regard to colleagues.

Nevertheless we did find low but significant relationship in regard to relations with laity \( r = .20 \) \( p < .01 \) and general self-image and utilization of skills \( r = .19 \) \( p < .01 \).

Again we see how the superior-subordinate relationship plays a key role in determining the priest's role gratifications and psychological success when we see the relation of Superior Sub-identity (supportive intellectual involved) with work satisfaction; \( r = .38 \), \( p < .01 \) and with utilization of skills; \( r = .28 \), \( p < .001 \).

As perhaps would be expected the relationship comes out clearly in relation of Superior sub-identity with the work climate cluster of Superior Support, \( r = .44 \), \( p < .001 \).

Examining the five dimensions of Job satisfaction, satisfaction with work itself and supervision seems to indicate the centrality of both facets of satisfaction as revealed by their high intercorrelations with other dimensions.
As against Hall and Schneiders correlations of Work Satisfaction (Work on Present Assignment with Pay, Promotions, Supervision and Co-worker, r's = .22, .40, .44, .49, we obtained correlations of .21, .39, .27 and .33.

It may be pointed out that in their study Work Satisfaction (Work on Present Assignment), the highest correlation was with co-workers r = .49 and next with Supervision. In our data Work Satisfaction correlates highest with Promotions r = .39 and next with co-workers r = .33.

As asserted by Hall and Schneider, our findings confirm the critical role of both Work itself and Supervision (Superior-sub-ordinate) relationship in the psychological success of Priest.

We have examined Work Activities, Work Climate and outcome variables of job satisfaction, Skill Utilization and Self-image. The analysis have taken the form of average amounts of factors experienced by priests of the three different levels, and correlations between variables and specifically the outcome variables. In this part of the discussion we will adopt, partially, the framework of analysis suggested by Hall & Schneider...
viz. the original Model of Psychological success in organization focusing more specifically on his best fit model.

We have not made use of professional specialists viz. the Specials as they have done, as a Criterion group, because of the restricted number of Specials in our sample (N = 14) which could give rise to sampling errors.

According to Hall and Schneider (1973), "the basic model of psychological success suggests that a person's values and conditions under which he works jointly determine his chances for experiencing psychological success. This model indicates that people must 1) have autonomy in their work, 2) have the opportunity to perform meaningful challenging tasks and 3) take advantage of the opportunities in the environment if they are to experience psychological success."

We will attempt to describe the hypothesized links between 1) personal qualities (self-image and work values, 2) personal behaviour (work performance), 3) assessment of assignment characteristics (challenge and autonomy) and 4) the resulting evaluation of the behaviour-in-context (feelings of skill utilization
and work satisfaction).

The framework in the figure was determined as the best fit in terms of multiple criteria. However, the figure does not represent the complete table of inter-correlations of the measures on which it is based and not all variables are as hierarchically arranged as illustrated in the figure. The figure in other words is only an abstract of the matrix.

It is true as Hall & Schneider (1973) have pointed out that sub-group analysis, at positions in the diocese would be a moderator of the hierarchically ordered relationships as pointed out also by Dunnette (1966) and Tyler (1965).

It is perhaps also true that "the correlations on the total sample would obscure important issues that are related to position and tenure in the diocese" (Hall & Schneider, 1973). Nevertheless in view of 1) the limitation of the sample of Specials and 2) the small number of certain groups in tenure (year of ordination), we had to work on the total sample.
FIG 2: RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PERSONAL, SITUATIONAL AND OUTCOME VARIABLES FOR TOTAL SAMPLE.
Nevertheless for two items on the JDI and the General Self-Image, we have worked out the correlations mentioned on Table 49.

With the limitations of the restricted sample, the Specials have a higher correlation between Supervision and Self-Image General ($r$ overall $= .60$). It would be recalled that the Specials had a higher significant satisfaction with Supervision than Specials. Table

Hall and Schneider, adopted the suggestion of Blalock (1964, 1969) to assess more precisely, how causality was operating in their career model. The Blalock approach was essentially of a) identifying rival models which could explain the relationships found and b) comparing through the use of partial correlation analysis the explanatory power of the original model vs alternative models.

We decided to compare our model with Hall and Schneider's revised model to determine and test our basic General Hypothesis. Is the Hall and Schneider's model of psychological success applicable in the West, valid for the Roman Catholic Diocesan Clergy of the East with special reference to the Archdiocese of Bombay.
TABLE 49

Intercorrelations of JDI Scales and Self-Image (General)
By Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vicars</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Satisfaction (JDI)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision (JDI)</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive (General)</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual (General)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved (General)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlations significant at the .05 level.
Blalock suggest reducing the number of variables to only the one's most central. We included in analysis of all Priests $N = 147$, the following variables similar to the one's retained by Hall and Schneider:

1. Self-image (average of all correlations for all three separate dimensions)
2. $A \times I$
3. Work Challenge
4. Supportive Autonomy
5. Work Satisfaction
Fig. 3: Original theoretical model and revised version. (see page 214)
Numbers below variable names are for reference purposes only

* Source: Hall Douglas, Benjamin Schneider. Organisation Climates and Careers,
Verifying the Best-Fit Model of Psychological Success:

According to Schneider's criteria of the psychological success model, the model of relationships which best fits the data of the total sample and priest on special assignment is presented in Fig.

The most critical variables and the reasons why they are deemed critical are given in the foregoing discussions as explained by Hall and Schneider.

1. Work Satisfaction

This criterion variable was chosen as the most global evaluation of the person in the situation. It is his appraisal of the degree to which career work is considered as rewarding to him as a person. In the final analysis, the other measures from the JDI were dropped for they were not considered central to their theoretical positions. It seems evident from data of matrices of correlations presented in Table Work Satisfaction is the central concept.

2. Use of Skills and Abilities

The experience that one has, of utilizing his important skills and abilities is viewed as a central part of the more global concept of work satisfaction.
In the case of professionals, we would anticipate a generally high relationship between feeling of skill utilization and work satisfaction. However, it is pertinent to mention here that as Dubin (1970) has pointed out not all workers who are satisfied with their work feel actualized in their work.

3. **Work Challenge**

A central concept in defining the conditions necessary for psychological success is that the individual is given an opportunity to attack work which he finds meaningful and challenging. In the case of professional careers, this is relatively to be expected (Glaser 1968).

4. **Supportive Autonomy**

The second aspect of climate which has been included is supportive autonomy, since this deals with the manner in which authority is diffused to points where decision making is consonant with the level required to make the decision, rather than where authority is centralised and hierachial in orientation. In the study by Hall and Schneider (1973) it was shown that "Specials who as a group are high on challenge and autonomy, have their self-image and their organizational values more immediately related to their
assessment of work challenge and meaning than do pastors and curates. Superior effectiveness was not retained for the analysis because:

1. It tends to be highly correlated with supportive autonomy; and

2. Theoretically the notion of autonomy at work, the opportunity to establish goals and the means for achieving these goals is more relevant.

5. Sum of amount of activities times importance of activities

This index \( (A \times I) \) summarizing the degree to which individuals are performing career related task which they value. This measure is a simple sum of the product of the activities: (activity \times importance). By summing across the products of amount times importance the changes in specific activities are nullified and a global index of how much a person is doing what he values is obtained.

6. General Self-Image:

This concept could be regarded as both a personal measure and an outcome measure. Hall and Schneider found that "under conditions of high autonomy that general self-image is most strongly related to task values and to the challenge and meaning found in the work."
We worked the partial correlation on the total sample with the variables given below in the Table.

### TABLE 50

Correlation for all position of 5 Central Concepts Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-Image</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (Amount x Imp)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work Challenge</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supportive Autonomy</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work Satisfaction</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We checked our data of partial correlation with that obtained by Hall and Schneider on these five variables.
### Table 51

**Partial Correlation for Best-Fit Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partial Should be Our Actuals</th>
<th>H&amp;S* Actuals</th>
<th>Partial Should be Our Actuals</th>
<th>H&amp;S* Actuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_{13.2}$: Positive + .27</td>
<td>+.401</td>
<td>$r_{25.3}$: Near Zero + .02</td>
<td>+.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{23.1}$: Positive + .22</td>
<td>+.343</td>
<td>$r_{12.3}$: Near Zero + .05</td>
<td>+.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{24.3}$: Near Zero - .19</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>$r_{35.4}$: Positive + .48</td>
<td>+.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{14.3}$: Near Zero + .08</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>$r_{35.2}$: Positive + .56</td>
<td>+.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{45.3}$: Near Zero + .10</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>$r_{35.1}$: Positive + .52</td>
<td>+.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{15.3}$: Near Zero + .09</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Hall & Schneider actuals:
Our findings summarized in this chapter lend strong support to the findings of Hall and Schneider and we could state that Hypothesis I that the Psychological Success Model for Roman Catholic Priest of the West is valid for church in East and in particular the Bombay Diocesan Clergy.

Since the Rectory Pattern and Parish Organization structure is the same in all Indian Dioceses we could state that the Psychological Success Model is valid for Priest in India.

We have also found that where the conditions for Psychological success are absent, they can lead to apathy, low satisfaction and lowered self-esteem as was found in our data with Assistants.

We noted that the mean scores on skill utilization and work satisfaction among Assistants is quite low. Even the Work activities is similarly restricted to a great deal to only one major activity. One could, therefore, conclude that the average level of psychological success among Assistants is quite low. Since this is the largest group of Priests in the
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Hypothesis II, therefore, in regard to the data for Priest as a whole and for Assistant is confirmed by our findings.